

3

A
DEFENCE
OF
THE WESLEYAN
THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,

AND OF THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTION-COMMITTEE
AND THE CONFERENCE RELATIVE THERETO,

IN REPLY TO THE
“REMARKS” OF DR. WARREN.

BY J. CROWTHER.

“Sic fatus——telumque imbelles sine ictu
Conjecit; raucos quod protinus ære repulsum,
Et summo clypei nequicquam umbone pependit.”
Virg.

FOURTH EDITION.

SOLD FOR THE AUTHOR,
BY J. MASON, 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON:
LOVE AND BARTON, NEWALL'S BUILDINGS;
AND JAMES EVERETT STOREY, MARKET-STREET, MANCHESTER.
MAY BE HAD OF ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXXXIV.

BW401

C 7 II 4

1834

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

J. Thompson (late Everett & Thompson), Printer,
30, New Cannon-street, Manchester.

Wes. 1427

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Public at large will claim no apology for the appearance of this Pamphlet. But to his honoured Fathers and Brethren in the ministry, the Author takes this opportunity of saying, that *to them* he holds himself responsible, both for the *act* of publication, and also for the *statements* and *reasonings*, which the following pages are designed to exhibit. In conformity with this acknowledgment, it is his intention to *solicit*, at the next Conference, an opportunity of stating the circumstances under which he has felt it his most painful yet imperative duty, to appear in this way before the public. And he is not without hope of being able so far to satisfy the Conference on that point, as to obtain an Act of Indemnity for any violation of the acknowledged principles of our Connexion, which such a publication may appear to involve.

DEFENCE, &c.

BEFORE entering on any thing which purports to be *argument* against the Wesleyan Theological Institution, the Author of the "Remarks" labours, by sundry *complaints*, to impress the minds of his readers with the idea that he has been marked out as the object of an ungenerous and oppressive persecution. And this method of exordium is well adapted to subserve the rhetorical purpose for which it is intended. For, if the Author can persuade his readers to admit, however slightly, the impression which such complaints are calculated to produce, he is tolerably sure of their good-will through the remainder of the pamphlet. But every candid and ingenuous reader will be careful, how he permits his judgment to be captivated by a stroke of rhetoric; and, ere he is persuaded to concede to the complainant, however loud his outcries, the advantage which he claims for himself and for his "cause," he will take time to consider, in what degree those outcries are warranted by truth and justice, and how far consequently the exordium, of which they compose the substance, is entitled to attention.

The Doctor's *first complaint* comes forth in the character of a whispering insinuation, respecting "impressions artfully circulated to his disadvantage, for the purpose of prejudicing his cause, and rendering his statements unavailing."* He does not say, however, who are the individuals against whom this insinuation is directed; and no evidence is given which goes at all to show, that there is any individual, or any "party," to whose account the sin of having "artfully circulated"—or of having circulated at all—"impressions to his

* Remarks, p. 3.

disadvantage," is fairly chargeable. The communication of the Secretary (of the Conference), to which so much prominence is given,—and concerning which the reader should be told that, although uttered "during one of the sittings of the assembly," it was uttered in the Doctor's *private* ear,—was not made until "towards the conclusion of the Conference," and "after the late discussion on the subject (of the Institution) had closed;" and impressions existing *at that time*—the only time to which the Secretary could refer—upon the minds of any of "the Brethren," are sufficiently accounted for, (without the harsh and unsupported supposition of their having been "circulated artfully"), from the fact that those Brethren had witnessed the discussion; during the course of which, each of them would naturally take an impression for himself, as to the various disputants, without being much affected by "impressions" volunteered at second-hand.

The next complaint is in a bolder strain, and has relation to a matter much more palpable. It is to this effect, that, in the course of a Committee Meeting (held on Thursday July 17th), at which several preachers and lay-gentlemen were present, Mr. Bunting "advisedly" denounced his opposition as "*the most unprincipled which he ever knew.*"* And, taking that expression in the form and meaning in which the Doctor has reported it, and apart from the *qualification* which will presently appear, it must be admitted that the charge which it is represented as involving, was a severe one; especially, if the individual, who is the object of it, must have credit for the meekness and forbearance which are implied in the assurance given to his readers, that "no merely harmless personalities, uttered in the heat of debate, shall call forth one word of replication, any more than they did at the moment of provocation." But ere the reader yields himself to the impression of that sympathetic resentment, which a charge so grave, and apparently so unprovoked, is calculated to excite, let him take into his account the important fact, that the Doctor himself had, long before that time,—

* Remarks, p. 7.

advisedly, and oftener than once—inflicted on the character of the Committee generally, or of some of the individuals who composed it, the very injury of which he now complains so loudly as having been inflicted on his own. Instance the charge, which he “openly expressed” in the October Committee, of an “extraordinary *assumption* of power.”* Add to this the farther charge of “artifice,” alleged against certain members of the same Committee, in his letter of February 22nd., and afterwards repeated, in his letter of March 15th, under the milder form of an insinuation respecting something not consistent “with simplicity and godly sincerity;”† and let it be remembered that this charge, though somewhat softer in its *aspect*, yet, in regard to a business so serious and weighty as that with which the Committee were entrusted, was not at all, *in substance*, less injuriously or less offensively significant, than that which he resents as having been so offensive and injurious to himself. Moreover, these charges had been insinuated elsewhere, during the interval between the date last-mentioned and the date of July 17th; and the Doctor had thus, indirectly at least, produced on lay-gentlemen as well as preachers, “impressions to the disadvantage” of the Committee, which—whether “circulated artfully” and “for the purpose,” or not,—yet had, in fact, to a certain extent, the effect “of prejudicing *their* cause and of rendering *their* statements unavailing.” Let the reader of the “Remarks” bear these facts in mind, in connexion with the fact, that at the time in question they were known to Mr. Bunting, and to the members of the Committee generally; and he will see that, having been the *first offender* in this way, neither the Doctor himself, nor any one on his behalf, has any just reason to complain, either of the *retort* of Mr. Bunting,—admitting it to have been as above stated,—or of the “silence” with which it was received. The reader of the “Remarks” is instructed to believe that it was a “*surprised* silence;” but the truth is, that under all the circumstances of the case, that retort did not very greatly, if at

* Remarks, p. 6. † Remarks, p. 26—28.

all, surprise either the preachers or the lay-gentlemen, in whose hearing it was uttered.

The Doctor bitterly complains of any "imputation of ambition—or of intrigue—or of grasping at place or power in our Connexion," as being "intemperate" and "cruel, nay, even slanderous,"* if he do but suspect that such an imputation is intended to be fixed, though only by an "inuendo," on *himself*; and yet this is precisely the imputation which he had himself previously uttered in express terms—with how little reason, it will hereafter appear—upon the character of those against whom he is complaining. If such insinuations are "ungenerous and un-Christian," as involving an "outrage, not only upon the charity which thinketh no evil, but also upon the ordinary rules of good breeding," whilst epithets of that description are so plentifully multiplied against an individual who, *on the worst possible supposition*, has only followed the example of Dr. Warren in the fault he has committed, let it not be forgotten by the Doctor or his readers, that such epithets recoil with double force upon himself.

But are we to admit the justice of the charge which the Doctor has alleged, when he asserts that Mr. Bunting "made a disingenuous insinuation, in order to impugn his *motives*, as though his opposition arose out of disappointed ambition, or something worse!"†—Let the simple fact of the case be stated, and it will presently be seen, that the imputation of this fault to Mr. Bunting is perfectly gratuitous, and palpably unjust. 'Tis true, he said the Doctor's opposition was "unprincipled," but then he added—"observe, I do not mean *bad* principle, but *without* principle;" and, with this qualification, the term should have conveyed no other meaning to the Doctor's mind, than that his opposition was considered by the speaker to be inconsistent and unreasonable, as being *grounded on no fixed and declared principle*;—the qualification above-stated plainly intimating that it was *rational*, and not *moral*, principle which was asserted to be wanting.—Why then does Dr. Warren, in spite of Mr. Bunting's honourable and

* Remarks, p. 10. † Remarks, p. 10

original protest to the contrary, adhere so pertinaciously to the idea, that in the employment of the epithet "un-principled," there was designed to be an imputation on his *motives*? Can it be unknown to him, that the term "principles" belongs to the province of *reason* with even greater propriety, according to the usage of our older and better writers, than it belongs to the province of *morality*? And have we not in this circumstance an explanation of the fact, that the compound term "un-principled," which has so strangely "frighted him from his propriety," is interpreted by Dr. Johnson as having *no other meaning* than the following: viz. "not settled in tenets or opinions?" To this meaning the innovating usages of modern times have added another and a harsher meaning, derived from the application of the term "principles" to moral motives. But this harsher and more offensive meaning was *distinctly and immediately disavowed* in the particular case in question; and, in all fairness therefore, the term as used by Mr. Bunting, must be understood in the milder and more respectably authorized sense, which is assigned to it by Dr. Johnson. Even supposing Mr. Bunting to have offered no explanation of his meaning *at the time*, he would have had a right to claim the advantage of that explanation *now*. In fact, the term "*unprincipled*" was used by him in a sense cognate to that in which the term "*principle*" had just before been used by Dr. Warren. "I stated," says the Doctor, "that in consequence of what had occurred at the October Committee, and the subsequent correspondence, I was constrained to dissent *in principle*—(not *on principle*)—from the *entire project*."* And in reply to this it was observed that his opposition was "*un-principled*;" in other words, it was the opposition of a man "*not settled* (as to the point in question) in his tenets or opinions." And, when it is remembered, that the Doctor *then for the first time expressed* to the Committee his opposition to the *principle* of their "project,"—having previously all along advocated and supported it,—and yet in making this announcement declined to *specify the reasons*, which had wrought so

* Remarks, p. 7.

great a change upon his judgment, on the pretext that "such an exposition would have been unsuitable to the Committee, as it was then composed,"* it would be difficult to say by what term his conduct in this instance could have been more appropriately characterized. If others of "the Brethren" have said any thing, which may be fairly construed into a more direct imputation on the Doctor's motives, let not Mr. Bunting, in this instance as in so many others, be the "scape-goat" to be loaded, for their sakes, with the imprecations of priest and people; but let every man, *this once*, be left to "bear his own iniquity."

Having not only never been a party to the imputation, which Dr. Warren has so warmly resented, but having on all occasions protested against the imputation, of his having been ambitious to hold office in the projected Institution, the writer of these Strictures is the more free to say, that he deeply regrets the ground of vindication which the Doctor has thought proper to adopt; especially, because some of the circumstances to which he has referred for that purpose, when properly and truly represented, are calculated to *fix* him in the predicament from which he has been naturally anxious to extricate himself. His first defence against the imputation in question is, that he voted in the October Committee in favour of the appointment of Mr. Bunting, as "President" of the Institution. And this fact may be accepted as evidence that, at least, he did not affect the honour of the Presidency. But with regard to the remaining appointments, the vindication he has offered will be far from being satisfactory to those who have been previously disposed to suspect him, when they are made acquainted with the true history of the affair. The Doctor's statement is, that "anxious to try at least the fairness of the motives which dictated such an anomalous and unwarrantable proceeding," as that of the Committee's nominating the President of the Institution, he "rose and named two individuals of unexceptionable character and qualifications, who were *not* members of the Committee, as suitable to be put

* Remarks, p. 7.

in nomination for the vacant offices.” And “did I not,” says he “(without waiting to see whether *I* was one of the elect), instantly nominate two of the ablest and most respectable of my Brethren for the remaining offices.”* But, according to the statement of other persons who were present, *one*, at least, of the individuals nominated by the Doctor, was proposed for a certain office by way of an *amendment on the previous nomination* of another person, and at a time when that one office only remained to be filled up. And thus the fact which has all along, justly or unjustly, operated so greatly to the Doctor’s disadvantage, and which his statement would conceal, stands forth to view, and

“grows again

Fresher than e’er it was”——

namely, the fact, that his *declared opposition* to the proceedings of the Committee—from whatever principle, rational or moral, that opposition may have arisen—commenced precisely at the time when the prospect—if ever he had any—of an office in the Institution, seemed to be precluded. The contempt with which he now affects to treat all offices in such an Institution, “under *such* a President,” does not relieve his case at all. His recent sneers upon that subject come too late, to be available for any other purpose than as evidence of his own grievous inconsistency. At the time when these offices were “vacant,” he did not judge them to be beneath the acceptance of “two of the ablest and most respectable of his Brethren;” and therefore, unless he must be charged with gross insincerity, or with excessive vanity, he could not, at the time in question, have estimated those offices at so low a rate as he would now appear to do. If suffering, in reality or in imagination, under any scandalous reflection on his motives, his vindication of himself would have been more honourable and successful, if he had sought to obviate the reflection, simply by a manly and indignant disavowal of such motives as he supposed to be wrongfully imputed to him, and by an appeal to his character and conduct during the time of his connexion

* Remarks, p. 5, 6.

with the Methodist Body. Had he contented himself with this, his only available and safe, method of procedure, he would have had all the benefit which such a disavowal and appeal could give him, without the abatement of corrections like those which have been given above. It is extremely painful to the writer of these Strictures to publish such corrections; but they could not have been withheld, without manifest injustice to those parties whose character the Doctor has, in his vindication of himself, involved in so unmerciful a condemnation.

The Doctor's *next* and *heaviest complaint* is against the Conference, or against some party in the Conference, and is to this effect, that he was "*refused the justice of vindicating himself and his cause against calumny, before that Assembly.*"* And the mind of the reader who can at once give credit to so broad and gross a statement, is thereby excited to a feeling which is sure to influence him in favour of the *person* representing himself to be so deeply injured, and which will probably influence him in favour also of the *arguments* that person may afterwards employ. But, before the reader accepts a charge like this against *so many who totally deny it*, on the testimony of *one*—or of a *few*, if more than one there be—who may continue to assert it, unless he will himself be guilty of the injustice which he is invited to condemn, let him "of his clemency hear us a few words."

In the first place, one may be allowed to ask, if Dr. Warren judged the expression alleged to have been uttered by Mr. Bunting, in the July Committee, to be a "calumny," why did he not proceed to vindicate himself at once, and why should he allow the wound, which it inflicted, to fret and fester on him? His own account is, that he "forbore to make any remark upon the unseemly outrage which had been committed," in consequence of his "adverting to the mixed character of the meeting in which they were associated, and to what was due to the reputation of ministers of Christ in the presence of their people."† And on this ground there would seem to have been a delicacy in his forbearance exceedingly praise-worthy.

* Remarks, p. 9. † Remarks, p. 7.

But let us employ the same rule of judging which the Doctor has so unfairly employed to Mr. Bunting's* disadvantage, on the subject of his *final* acceptance of the Presidency of the Theological Institution ;† and then “ the correct interpretation of this saying,” and of the sense in which the Doctor understands “ what is due to the reputation of ministers of Christ in the presence of their people,” “ will be found in the” charges of “artifice,” “assumption of power,” “dishonourable intrigue,” “crooked and shifting policy,” “indecent and unmannerly uproar,” and other charges, so copiously furnished in the Pamphlet which calls forth these Strictures. The conclusion is inevitable—that there is, as yet, no apparent reason for his declining to justify himself in the presence of the July Committee, and that there must have been some other reason for his forbearance on that occasion, than the delicate consideration which he has chosen to assign.

* In the first edition of this “Defence” no special notice was taken of the ungenerous and offensive manner in which Dr. Warren has referred to the language and behaviour of Mr. Bunting, in connexion with his acceptance of the Presidency—merely because the Author thought the “calumny” too “silly” to be credited, and therefore unnecessary to be contradicted. It has appeared, however, that there are persons sufficiently “credulous” of such representations, to believe that they are founded in truth. Let the reader know, then, that Mr. Bunting's declaration was not, simply, what the Doctor has reported, but was connected with another statement, which very materially qualifies its meaning. His words were to the following effect—that “*if* he could be *assured* that such suspicions in regard to himself as those which Dr. Warren had expressed, were entertained to any extent by others of his Brethren,—*in that case*, nothing short of the threat of expulsion should induce him to accept office in the intended Institution.” If there were really any other preacher who entertained the like suspicion, he had not the honesty to express it. The Conference therefore, and Mr. Bunting also, had a right to conclude that Dr. Warren was alone, or nearly so, in his suspicions, and Mr. Bunting's acceptance of office in the Institution was perfectly consistent with his previous declaration. The “high pitch of voice” and the “alarming violence of gesticulation,” thrown in by the Doctor, to add effect to “the mere matter of curiosity” which he has composed, are *embellishments* worthy of the story which they are intended to adorn. The latter of these embellishments, in particular, the Author does not hesitate to say, is a *mere invention*.

† Remarks, p. 31.

We can only say at present, that, for some reason or other, he chose to content himself with the "hope of setting himself right with his Brethren in the Conference." And, if the indulgence of that hope was creditable to his own feelings, it was creditable also to the character of the Conference to which he intended to appeal, as being—in the judgment of one who had had experience of its proceedings "now between thirty and forty years, as a Preacher in the Methodist Body"—an Assembly before which a man *may* "set himself right," if he be only properly disposed to do so.

But, if the question of "calumny," between the Doctor and any member of the Institution-Committee, was to be heard, either "before that Assembly" or in any other place, surely the members of that Committee generally, being the parties *first* aggrieved by what *they* considered to be "calumny" on *his* part, had the first right to complain. Even admitting Mr. Bunting to have forfeited *his* right, in consequence of the retort which he dealt out in the July Committee, yet there were others, against whom the Doctor's charges had also been alleged, and who had still an unquestionable right to insist upon it, that the Doctor should first "set himself right" with his Brethren on the subject of the injury which he had inflicted on the character of others, ere he should be permitted to complain of any similar injury as having been inflicted on his own. The members of that Committee, deeply injured as they were, both in and out of doors, forbore to make their claim. And it might have been expected that, in conformity with that spirit of forbearance by which he professes himself to have been influenced in the Committee, he would have been induced to imitate the honourable example of forbearance which was thus set before him in the Conference. His offence against the Committee, thus kindly passed over, was surely equivalent to the offence of one of that Committee against *him*.

Or, if he must, at all events,—notwithstanding the fact of his having been "first in the transgression," and notwithstanding the forbearance of his Brethren,—urge his complaint

before the Conference, why,—one may ask again,—why did he not embrace an opportunity of offering the vindication which he thought so necessary, at the time when the characters of the Preachers were, according to the annual custom, one by one, submitted to enquiry? How came it to pass that, when the name of “Jabez Bunting” was read over, nothing was said by Dr. Warren, or by any other, of the *intemperance* and *cruelty* and *slander*, with which he has been subsequently charged, and for the imputation of which he is now pilloried without a hearing?—and that too by the very individual who is, at this moment, dinning the public ear with outcries against the supposed injustice of having been refused a hearing for himself, and who, with a most inconsistent self-complacency, congratulates himself and the public on the advance of “a more liberal state of things!”—Or, if the Doctor did not wish to allege any thing by way of formal *accusation* against the Committee generally, or against Mr. Bunting in particular, how did it happen that he suffered his own name to be read over, without embracing the occasion then afforded, to “clear himself from the unworthy aspersions which (in his judgment) had been cast upon him?” Especially, since here again he had the benefit of an instructive and encouraging example, in the case of a Preacher of equal standing and respectability with himself, who, on the reading of *his* name, took occasion to complain of an injurious statement which had been circulated in private conversation, and succeeded, without being annoyed by any kind of “uproar,” in effecting for himself a satisfactory and honourable vindication. Had the Doctor chosen to avail himself of either of the opportunities just mentioned, he would have acted in conformity with what he well knows to be the standard usage of the Conference, and he would have had the full advantage, both for himself and for the “cause” which he was afterwards to advocate, of any vindication of himself, which he might have thought proper to propose.

The true reason of this mysterious forbearance—at least the only reason that appears on the face of the pamphlet or elsewhere—is, that he thought it best for the “cause” he had

resolved to advocate, to pursue the same policy in his procedure at the Conference, on the subject of the projected Institution, which he has been careful to pursue in the arrangement of his pamphlet. The vindication of himself which he proposed, if we may judge from what is given in "the Speech," and in other parts of his pamphlet, was such as deeply to implicate the conduct and motives of others; and it was manifestly his object, so to *time* that vindication, that it might stand as an exordium to the speech which he intended to deliver against the "Plan" to be proposed by the Institution Committee, and that it might thus have the effect of prejudicing the minds of the Brethren generally against that Plan, through the medium of a prejudice against the Committee by whom it was brought forward. Indeed, on any other supposition, the statement made in p. 4, of the Remarks—that "the commencement of his address" against the Institution was "the *only moment* when it would have been of any material value"—is utterly inexplicable. This policy is well known to those who have studied the art of public pleading; and it is a policy well known in practice. Has the Doctor been so bewitched by Cicero, in the course of that acquaintance with him, by which, in part, we may presume he won the Academical distinction that adorns his name, as to have adopted that kind of policy—as a policy that is quite proper to be used on *all* occasions—from the shrewd instructions which that incomparable master gives? Or, has he learned it from the practice of our courts of civil judicature, and of our Houses of Parliament? The literary character, which in all courtesy must be associated with his name, would lead us to the former supposition; and we might readily adopt it, though with the hazard of its furnishing an instance of "the base alloy" which may sometimes be introduced under the "showy tinsel of external decorations," through the insidious channel of Academical instruction. But, from the Doctor's peculiar attachment to, and frequent use of, such terms as "cause"—"prerogative"—"liberty of the Preachers"—and "rights of the People,"—it seems more probable that he has learned this policy from that

practice of our civil courts and of our Houses of Parliament, to which it is the fancy of some persons, who "know not what they do," to assimilate all the judicial, and even the deliberative, proceedings of the Conference. Come from what source it may, such policy is far too "crooked" for the deliberations of an assembly, having objects like those for which the Conference is professedly convened. In our courts of *civil* judicature, an advocate, on either side of any "cause," is allowed to prejudice the minds, both of the judge and of the jury, if he can, by statements and insinuations purposely intended to cast odium and discredit on the parties to whom he is opposed; it being clearly understood that he is contending, not for *truth* and *justice* abstractedly considered, but for the interests of those on whose behalf he is retained. And in parliamentary deliberations, a speaker is permitted to canvass, not only the merits of the question which may be before the House, but also the conduct, and sometimes even the motives, of those by whom it is supported or opposed. And if by such means a victory can be obtained over an opposing party, all parties in the House admit that victory to be a fair one; in other words, there is nothing un-parliamentary in such a method of proceeding. But in an assembly of Christian Ministers, convened for the purpose of consulting on matters connected with the interests of religion, and the spiritual profit of the Societies committed to their charge, every speaker, as well as every hearer, is bound by the most solemn obligations to regard that only which in itself is good and true; and in conformity with this principle, the "carnal and worldly policy," which is so often connected with merely secular and civil business, should be most carefully avoided.

The question before the Conference, at the time when Dr. Warren rose to make "The Speech" now published, was, whether the Conference should adopt the "Principles and General Outline" of a "Plan for the improvement of the Junior Preachers," which a Committee, specially appointed to prepare it, then recommended for adoption. In other words, the simple question was, whether it was "expedient" to

establish a "Theological Institution," for the above named purpose, on the "Plan" proposed;* the question about *officers* being wholly out of the account. Now, surely, whether Dr. Warren or Mr. Bunting were to blame, or on the supposition that they both were blamable, the abstract question, as to the expediency of establishing such an Institution, remains precisely the same. The Doctor was therefore *interrupted* in his attempt to mix up matters of *personal crimination and defence* with the discussion of *that* question. Not that his right to defend himself or to criminate others was denied, but that it was altogether out of order to introduce criminatory remarks like those in which he was indulging, into the discussion of an abstract question; and that the serious charges involved in those remarks must necessarily be a subject of separate investigation—which investigation he was plainly told he might have, if he thought proper. Still, in the exercise of that indulgence with which the Conference is always disposed to treat a Senior Brother, and *at the special request of Mr. Bunting* amongst others, he was, after all, permitted to deliver a speech which, by his own acknowledgment, is "nearly verbatim" as "The Speech" now published, "with the exception of (only) a few sentences."* Yes, few indeed. Let there be taken from it two or three sentences, which have been engrafted on it from the speeches of "Brethren who supported the Amendment," and scarcely another sentence will remain, which those who attended the debate will not remember to have heard delivered by Dr. Warren in the Conference. In justice to the Conference, and for the information of the reader, the "few sentences" in that Speech, "which the clamour of opposition rendered inaudible, or the authority of *the Chair* constrained to be suppressed," should have been *distinguished*. The reader might then have seen,—what the report of the Speech in the Doctor's Pamphlet does not enable him to see—how far his present complaint, of having been refused the justice of pleading his "cause" before the Conference, is worthy of attention.

* See Minutes of the Conference, 1834, p. 95—98. † Remarks, p. 9.

Even on the supposition that the Doctor *was* denied altogether the opportunity of interweaving into his Speech those *reflections upon others*, which he so strangely puts forth by way of obviating a “dishonourable imputation” on himself, yet he had other opportunities of vindicating himself, before the Conference concluded. And in neglecting to embrace those opportunities, with the sentiments which he then held, he was greatly wanting in his duty, both to himself and to his Brethren. The reader will bear in mind the “ingenuity”—and “artifice”—and “crooked policy”—and “dishonourable intrigue”—and “extraordinary assumption of power” and “sinister motives”—with which the Doctor believed the Committee to be chargeable. When therefore, on the adoption of the Plan which that Committee had proposed, the questions successively were, whether Mr. Hannah, Mr. Entwisle, and Mr. Bunting, should be appointed to certain offices in the Institution, Dr. Warren, to be consistent with himself, ought *then* to have objected to every one of them, as having proved themselves, by their proceedings “in Committee” and elsewhere, to be utterly unworthy of the trust connected with those offices. Nay further, he ought also to have moved, at some stage or other of the proceedings of the Conference, that the individuals above-named should be forthwith dismissed to some remote location, where they might have less power to exercise their mischievous propensities, and where they might expiate to their Brethren, in retirement and penitence, the offences of “usurpation” and “intrigue” of which they had been guilty.* And in his pleading on that subject, he would have had “ample scope, and verge enough,” for that sort of vindication which he has offered in his Pamphlet.

On the whole, admitting the Doctor to have been *partially interrupted*—and that is the utmost that can be admitted, con-

* The reader will observe that Mr. Hannah was the writer of the Pamphlet put forth by the October Committee, and Mr. Entwisle was the “venerable member of the Committee,” referred to in p. 22 of the Remarks.—The circumstance there mentioned, and other charges against the Committee, will be noticed in the sequel.

sistently with truth—in the irregular and disorderly vindication of himself which he attempted in his Speech against the Institution,—still, inasmuch as both *before* and *after* the delivery of that speech, he had *other* opportunities of vindicating himself, and yet, in perfect silence and without any inhibition from “the Chair” or from any other quarter, allowed those opportunities to pass away, the complaint of having been “refused the justice of vindicating himself and his cause,” and the apology for his recent publication, on the ground that it was “the *only method* allowed him of disavowing the base motives which had been openly imputed to him,”*—this complaint, we say, and the apology connected with it, are *utterly without foundation*.

Having noticed the *complaints* of the Doctor, we may now proceed to an examination of that part of his pamphlet, which bears the character of *argument*. His own statement gives us authority to say, that “his reasons against the Institution are now fairly laid before his Brethren and the Methodist Public,”† and we are called to the duty “of examining the validity of the ground on which” those reasons rest.

His *First Reason* is, “that the projected Institution, however plausible it may appear in theory, would be found in fact and in working, to be a very considerable departure from the original and uniform practice of Methodism hitherto.” We are thankful to observe he does not say that it will be a departure from the *principles* of Methodism. We are thus saved the necessity of showing, at any length, that the *principle* of such an Institution as that which is proposed, is strictly in accordance with the views and sentiments of Mr. Wesley. It will be sufficient to observe, in opposition to the Note of Dr. Warren on that point, that the *written* testimony cited by Mr. Watson, from an authentic MS. of Minutes of the Conference corrected by Mr. Wesley, must certainly be permitted to outweigh the *oral and unsupported* testimony of any individual, however grave and respectable, who may, at this late time of day, be pleased to

* Remarks, p. 4.

† Remarks, p. 9.

interpose his *ipse-dixit* to the contrary.* And is the establishment of a Theological Institution, on the Plan which the Conference has adopted, really a departure from the *practice* of Methodism? The natural effect of a statement so sweeping as that which the Doctor has propounded, is to alarm "the Body generally," as if some strange revolution were now sought to be effected, by the Conference, in the entire economy of Methodism. But let the reader recover himself from his alarm, and ask himself this simple question—What is the *particular practice* which is about to be departed from? And to this question he will find it not merely difficult, but actually impossible, even with the assistance of the Doctor's Pamphlet, to render a direct and categorical answer. At least there is to be no departure from the "practice of Methodism," as it relates to the successive trainings and examinations which have been hitherto required, in the case of those who are recommended to the Conference as candidates for the ministry. On the contrary, it is expressly provided,†

"That all Preachers, who shall have passed through the various examinations required by our existing Rules, and obtained the consent of their respective Quarterly Meetings, and the recommendation of the Superintendents and District-Meetings, and shall have been placed by the Conference on the President's List of Reserve, *and none else*, shall be eligible for admission into this Institution."

And there is to be no departure from the "original and uniform practice" of the Conference, as to the exercise of a discretionary power of dismissing any Preacher who, after having been placed upon the President's List of Reserve, or after

* The following are Mr. Watson's Notes upon that subject:—"As the subject of a Seminary or College has been of late brought under discussion, it may be not uninteresting to those who have not access to the manuscript copies of the first Minutes, extracts from which only are in print, to give the passages which relate to this subject from the complete Minutes of 1744 and 1745. In the former year it is asked, "Can we have a Seminary for labourers?" and the answer is, "If God spare us till another Conference." The next year the subject was resumed, "Can we have a Seminary for labourers yet?" Answer. "Not till God gives us a proper Tutor." So that the Institution was actually resolved upon,

† Minutes of Conference, 1834, p. 95.

being actually employed as an Itinerant Preacher, may finally be judged to be ineligible for the work. On the contrary, that practice is now formally recognized by Resolution IV.; with a special provision against the unnecessary expense and inconvenience which might sometimes occur, from the introduction to the Institution of men who, after all, were never likely to be serviceable. And there is to be no departure from the practice of Methodism, as to the "human might or power," and "political patronage," and "worldly embellishments," of which Methodism, in its "extraordinary character," has heretofore been almost entirely independent. Neither "human might or power," nor "political patronage," nor "worldly embellishments," are at all contemplated in the "Plan" of the projected Institution. Much less is there any thing in that Plan, which goes at all to substitute such things in the place of the "Spirit of the Lord of Hosts."—The Doctor himself admits the Plan to "appear plausible *in theory*;"—by which, if he mean any thing at all, he must intend to say that there is nothing in that Plan, considered in itself, which is fairly open to objection. Had it been otherwise, of course he would have told us. It is easy to create alarm by general and indefinite protests against the danger of departing from the long-established practices of Methodism. But on examination it is seen that, in this case, *positively, no practice is departed from*. On the contrary, *all the good old practice*, to which the Methodists are so much indebted, and to which for that reason they are so ardently devoted, *is retained untouched and unimpaired*, with a provision *super-added*, by the benefit of which a Preacher, when admitted on the List of Reserve, may forthwith have the opportunity of applying himself, under the

and delayed only by circumstances. Perhaps not more than one or two manuscript copies of the complete Minutes of the Conferences from 1744 to 1747 are in existence. That which lies before me, and from which extracts have been made in the preceding pages, wants two or three of the first pages of the Minutes of 1744. It was not written by Mr. Wesley; but is a copy corrected by his own hand in different places. This is mentioned, as several of the extracts will be new even to some of the senior Preachers."—*Life of Wesley*, p. 201—204.

direction of competent instructors, and without the interruption of any secular vocation, to those *peculiar studies and employments*, which are proper to his new character and calling.

Or, admitting, for the sake of argument, that the Plan of this Institution does involve a *partial* "departure from the original and uniform practice of Methodism hitherto;" yet, unless we will arrogate to ourselves the attribute of *infallibility* in *practice*, as the Papists claim *infallibility* in *faith*, it still remains to be proved that the departure is an evil. No proof having been alleged as yet, we have nothing more than the bare assertion, with variations, that there "will be"—not *in theory*, but—"in *fact* and in *working*, a considerable departure from the practice of Methodism." And the *proof* of this assertion, if any, may be expected in some of the succeeding "Reasons."

His *Second Reason* against the Theological Institution is, "*that the improved and improving state of Society generally, will not fail to furnish suitable men for the work to which they may be called, conformably to our ordinary manner of training.*"

—His *Third Reason* is, "*that the signal success with which it has pleased Almighty God to own the course hitherto pursued, indicates rather the wisdom of walking by the same rule, and minding the same things, than of commencing a new course, however small the divergency may seem at the outset.*"

These two Reasons are here placed together, because, as arguments against the Theological Institution, they both contain the same species of fallacy, and admit of the same easy refutation.—If the question were, whether, without a Theological Institution, Methodism could continue to exist and prosper *at all*, the Doctor's reasons would be quite in place. But that is not the question. No one has ever yet pretended to maintain that Methodism may not prosper, to a certain extent, though no such Institution should ever be established. The proper and the *only* question is, whether our Connexion, already prosperous in some degree, would not prosper more abundantly, if by means of a Theological Institution—the

“Plan” of which Dr. Warren himself *tacitly* admits to be, *in theory*, so unobjectionable—its Ministers could, in the outset of their public course, be formed to a more accurate acquaintance with those things, which are to be the rule of their procedure, and the subjects of their ministry. And to this question the Doctor’s *Second* and *Third* Reasons, above-stated, are utterly inapplicable, except upon the monstrous supposition that those who are already doing well, cannot, *by any possibility*, do better.—The Conference has not adopted the Plan of the Theological Institution, as being *absolutely necessary* to the continuance of Methodism, but only as being “*expedient for promoting the more effectual improvement of the Junior Preachers.*”*

Will Dr. Warren allow the same mode of reasoning, which he has employed against the establishment of the Theological Institution, to be employed against himself?—Before his entrance at the Glasgow University, he was a zealous, acceptable, and successful minister of Christ. And should not “the success with which it had pleased Almighty God to own the course which he had previously pursued, have indicated to him the wisdom of walking by the same rule, and minding the same things, rather than of commencing a new course, however small the divergency might seem at the outset?”—In conformity with his own principle, and especially, according to the wondrous *truism* which supports his Second Reason,—that “the men raised up” in our Connexion “are indigenious

* Admitting the Doctor’s *second* and *third* Reasons to be applicable to the question at issue, still the *propositions* they contain require to be *demonstrated*. In the face of all the Doctor’s facts and illustrations, the truth of those propositions, and especially the truth of the proposition contained in his Second Reason, has been, and may be, very fairly controverted, as will appear from the following letter, written by the late venerable Dr. Adam Clarke.

City Road, June 14th, 1806.

“We have now a subject of the deepest concern before us.—We want,—God knows!—We want some kind of seminary for educating such workmen for the vineyard of our God, as need not be ashamed; but who now, through the disadvantageous situations and circumstances in which they have been bred, *know not even how to use* the talents

to the soil and climate in which they are reared"—he ought to have been careful how he exposed himself to "the (insalubrious ?) fumes of a (hot-house ?) University; lest he should thereby "degenerate and become worthless, if not even noxious." In the face of all this peril, he entered himself in the Humanity Class of the above-named University, and thus made the experiment of engrafting Academical instruction on the advantages derived from "our ordinary manner of train-

which God has given them. I introduced a conversation on the subject this morning; and the Preachers were unanimously of opinion, that some strong efforts should be made without delay, to get such a place established, either at Bristol or London, where young men, who may be deemed fit for the work, may have (were it but twelve months, or even half a year's) previous instruction, in *Theology*, in *Vital Godliness*, in *Practical Religion*, in *English Grammar*, and the *Rudiments of general Knowledge*. No person to be permitted to go out into the work, who was not well,—fully,—known to be unblamable in his conversation, thoroughly converted to God in his soul, alive through the indwelling Spirit, and sound, *perfectly* and *indubitably* sound in the Faith. What can we do to get this matter set on foot? The people are getting wise on all hands: Socinianism, and other *isms*, equally as bad, are gaining *strength* and *boldness*. As a *Body*, we cannot stand and speak with our enemies in the gate, much less turn the battle to the gate. Many of the Preachers are in a state of comparative nonage; because they have had no help, no director of their studies, no pointer-out of method, no explorer of the paths in which they should tread. *Every Circuit* cries out, "Send us *acceptable* Preachers." How can we do this? We are obliged to take what offers; and depend on the recommendations of those, who can scarcely judge but merely from the *apparent* fervour of a man's spirit. My dear Brother, the time is coming, and now is, when *illiterate piety* can do no more for the interest and *permanency* of the work of God, than *lettered irreligion* did formerly. The Dissenters are going to establish a Grammar-school; and have sent about to all *our* people, as well as their own, for countenance and support. Would not God have *our* Charity in this respect to begin at home? Are there not many of our people, who would subscribe largely to such a work as that which I recommend? If we could raise funds, the first year, for the instruction of only *three or six persons*, would it not be a glorious thing? Perhaps, about *twenty* would be the utmost we should ever need to have at once under instruction; as this is the greatest average number we should take out in a year.

"Speak, O speak *speedily* to all your friends! let us get a plan organized without delay. Let us have something that we can lay,

ing." And will any one say that he has subsequently been less zealous, less acceptable, or less successful, than he was before? Will it not rather be admitted on all hands, that if he had the opportunity of embracing such additional advantages, without neglecting his duty as the Superintendent of the Glasgow Circuit, his example is deserving of universal commendation?

Considerable importance is attached to the three Reasons above-mentioned by sundry worthy and well-meaning persons, but does Dr. Warren himself really attach any importance to them, if *separately taken*? That he does not, must be obvious at a glance, inasmuch as his adoption of these Reasons, as arguments against the Theological Institution, is utterly *inconsistent with his own oft-repeated professions of opinion, and with his deliberate conduct*. Instance the speech

matured, before the Conference. God, I hope, is in the proposal: and we should not promise our strength or influence to others, till we find, either that we can do nothing for ourselves, or that nothing is requisite.

I am, &c.

A. CLARKE."

See a Tract entitled "Observations, &c.—Printed by order of the Conference."

In further proof that the statements contained in Dr. Warren's *Second* and *Third* Reasons are more than questionable, it may be observed that the "New Connexion," founded by the late Rev. Alexander Kilham, have recently determined to adopt some Plan for the more effectual improvement of *their* Junior Preachers. Accordingly, at their last Conference, a "Ministers' Preparatory Instruction-Committee" was appointed, to prepare a Plan for that purpose. That Committee met in August; and a *printed* Circular, dated August 28, 1834, and having the signature of Mr. John Ridgway, as "Corresponding Member of the Committee," is now before the Author. The purport of this Circular, is to explain the general outline of the provisional plan which that Committee has agreed on, and to solicit pecuniary aid from those "who have the ability and will, to help this good work forward."—The Committee "have resolved upon entrusting the work in question to Mr. Allin, at his residence in Sheffield;" and "the friends" are to be requested to pay their subscriptions in advance, and to "forward them to the Treasurer, by the 25th of September." It is further provided that "the Circuit, which enjoys the services" of the young men, is "to pay twenty pounds per annum for each of them." And all this, not merely on the ground that such a course is "expedient," but on the ground that "the necessity of some such preparatory help is *indisputable*."

which he delivered in the Conference of 1833, to the effect that the present "manner of training" young men was exceedingly defective, and that it was expedient to have some plan which, with other advantages, should present facilities for Classical instruction. Instance the fact, that when it was proposed in the October Committee that some establishment, yet un-named, should be provided to supply that want, the Doctor earnestly contended that they should call the establishment a College; and that they should *make* it what they *called* it, by furnishing the elements at least of a Collegiate education; whilst Mr. Bunting, with a simplicity and moderation for which the Doctor's Pamphlet would leave him little credit,—and every semblance of which, like the "frankness" of the Rev. Robert Newton, must henceforth be branded with the epithet "affected"—yes—Mr. Bunting did really contend for the less ostentatious and aspiring name and uses of the "Wesleyan Theological Institution," on the ground that the Collegiate education for which the Doctor was contending, was far beyond what it was reasonable and proper for that Committee to contemplate, and far also beyond what the Conference would be able to realize in practice. Instance again the fact, that Dr. Warren did actually vote in favour of all the Resolutions, which were published in the Pamphlet put forth by the October Committee,* although those Resolutions proposed a Plan much more extensive, and, on other grounds, much more open to objection, than that which has been recently adopted.

How is this inconsistency to be accounted for? Either the force of the three Reasons given above, and now so seriously insisted on, was felt by Dr. Warren, before he met the rest of the Committee in October, 1833; or it was not. If it was, then he neither dealt honestly with his Brethren, nor with his "cause," nor with his own heart, in voting for any one of all the Resolutions which they passed. And, if the force of those Reasons was not felt by him before that time, there is no reason to suppose that he attaches any great importance to those reasons at this day. The fact is, he *saw* those Reasons

* "Proposals, &c."

at the October Committee, as reasons which many sober and well-affected persons were disposed to urge against the establishment of any Institution for the purposes required; for, *in that form*, those Reasons, along with others, were proposed by one of the Committee (Mr. Ward) for their serious consideration; but, as reasons which ought to have any effect on his own judgment, he *felt* them not at all. Nor is there any reason to suppose he feels them *now*, as having any importance *in themselves*, but only as having an importance borrowed, at second-hand, from certain other considerations, with which he has been pleased to link them, but with which they have in reality no more *logical connexion*, than they have with any proposition one might name in Metaphysics or Geometry. If any doubt of this remain upon the reader's mind, let him now notice the Doctor's Fourth Reason, and the terms in which he introduces it.

His *Fourth Reason* is, "*that the Institution now proposed has an obvious tendency to increase such power in the hands of A FEW INDIVIDUALS, as is likely to be detrimental to the liberty of the Preachers, and perilous to the unity of the Body itself.*" And of this Reason he says, it is "the weightiest reason of all the rest, because all the rest appear to him to be contained in it, and naturally to flow from it."—Let us suppose it to be as he has said, and it will follow that, if the three preceding Reasons are "contained in" the Fourth, and "naturally flow from" it, then, by his own admission, unless he had seen something valid in the Fourth Reason, he would have seen nothing valid in the three preceding Reasons; and, if there is nothing in the Fourth Reason, there is nothing in "the rest," which are said to be "contained in it," and "naturally to flow from it." And this is perfectly accordant with what is stated elsewhere in the course of the "Remarks." For, as the Author tells us, "almost all his arguments arose out of what took place in Committee,"* and it was "the detection (in some of the proceedings of that Committee) of certain principles in operation, perilous to the Christian liberty of the great body of

* Remarks, p. 9.

the Preachers, and also of the People with whom we are united, which first excited his alarm!"—It is thus sufficiently apparent that Dr. Warren attaches great importance to his *Fourth* Reason. Indeed, so highly does he estimate it, that for the sake of adding weight and cogency to *it*, he has adopted *three other* Reasons which, previously to his adoption of that *Fourth* Reason, never occurred to his attention, or, if they did, yet never seriously influenced his judgment. But is it true, in fact, that his First Three Reasons are "contained in" the *Fourth*, and that they "naturally flow from" it? Let any one read over the *Fourth* Reason, and then try whether he can, by any process of induction, extract the three preceding Reasons from it.—It must be an exceedingly ingenious and perverse species of Logic, that can deduce from it the *First* Reason. But neither his *Second*, nor his *Third* Reason, can be deduced from it by any process whatsoever. They are *not* "contained in it," and cannot therefore by any means be made "to flow"—much less do they flow "naturally—from it." If, mindful of that better Logic which he is capable of exercising, the Doctor had distinguished between *men* and *things*, he would have avoided this mistake, and would have left his *Fourth* Reason to stand, as it ought to do, on its own merits.

It would greatly have assisted the judgment of his readers, if the Doctor had been pleased to specify the "power" to which that Reason so alarmingly refers, and in what way it will be likely to produce the mischief he predicts. He has not done so, and, by his reserve upon that point, he has left his readers in a darkness in which they may, according to their various inclinations and capacities for superstition of that sort, *imagine* to themselves such *apparitions* as they please, of things "perilous and detrimental,"—

"Gorgons, and hydras, and chimæras dire."

It is evident, moreover, that he is himself in the darkness, in which he has involved his readers. And the first effect of this darkness on himself is, that he starts back affrighted from the "perilous and detrimental" object which his own fancy has created, or which—to borrow his own words—he "saw, or thought

he saw!"—and then immediately rushes on an inconsistency which, but for that darkness, he would surely have avoided. "Far be it from me"—says he, after announcing his *Fourth Reason*—"far be it from me to insinuate that any preconceived scheme of infringing the liberty of their Brethren, or the rights of the People, is in the contemplation of any of the honourable members of the Committee." And yet, behold, the very insinuation against which he thus gravely protests, almost immediately follows: For, says he—"that the Committee entered at all upon the question of the officers to be appointed over the Institution, thus attempting *themselves* to create the faculty—was a very *suspicious circumstance*." And in the next paragraph he adds—"an intimation was given (unwittingly) by a venerable member of the Committee, that the subject had already been carefully considered *previous* to the Meeting!" It is but fair to presume, that by one of those laws of association, which sometimes operate without being observed, it was this specimen of his *own* consistency, that suggested to his mind the "precious specimen of consistency," which he is pleased in the same paragraph to charge to the account of the Committee. How—but for the darkness just referred to—how came the Doctor not to see, that this charge of inconsistency, if there be any ground for it—which we deny—returns upon himself? The Pamphlet, on which he has so severely animadverted, "was submitted to the members of the Committee for their approbation*," and it was submitted, for that purpose, to *himself*. And if only the word "*not*" might have been inserted in one sentence, there was nothing else in the whole Pamphlet to which he was unwilling to append the sanction of his name. All other faults and imperfections whatsoever, he was ready to forgive, and even patronize, for the sake of the advantage he anticipated from that significant and weighty monosyllable. With that solitary exception, therefore, whatever there may be of inconsistency, or of any thing besides that is blame-worthy, in that Pamphlet, the Doctor must needs take his full and proper share of the

* Remarks, p. 25.

general responsibility. And for the same reason, he is distinctly and unequivocally pledged, *in print*, to all the *reasonings* and *conclusions* which are therein contained, directly contrary as many of those reasonings and conclusions are, to the "Remarks" which have so recently appeared. Let any person read that Pamphlet, and—having previously inserted the word "not," where Dr. Warren affirms it to be wanting—let him remember that, with that correction, the whole Pamphlet has the *avowed* and *formal* sanction of his name. Let him then read over the "Remarks," and say, to which of the two parties, in this case, the prize of inconsistency must be awarded.

Leaving these matters, however, let us examine the validity of the subsidiary "reasons," stated by Dr. Warren, "for entertaining fears" of something "hazardous." They are the following:—First, "*That the Committee entered at all upon the question of the officers to be appointed over the Institution, was a very suspicious circumstance,—thus attempting themselves to create the Faculty.*" Secondly, "*that one and the same individual was proposed to occupy the following offices—first, to be the President of the Institution—secondly, to be a Theological Tutor—and thirdly, still to retain the Senior Secretaryship of our Foreign Missions.*" Thirdly, "*that a proposal was actually made in the Committee, that, having nominated the President of the Institution, the choice of all the other officers might be left to himself.*" Fourthly, "*that the methods had recourse to, in order to represent to the Connexion the unanimity of the Committee in their conclusions, were not sufficiently characterized by simplicity and godly sincerity.*"

These "reasons," it will be seen, in purporting to argue something "likely to be detrimental," assert the *fact*, of an ambitious and monopolizing usurpation, as having been already practised on the part of the Committee, with not a little of intrigue and artifice besides. In answer to *such* charges, and to the argument which rests upon them, nothing more is *really necessary*, than an appeal to "the long (and justly) established reputation of the greater part of the Committee for their wisdom, and prudence, and modesty." But, that the

facts of the case may be more clearly understood, let the following statement, furnished on the evidence of eye and ear-witnesses, be candidly considered.

In the course of their deliberations, the Committee having agreed on certain *principles* and *plans* as the basis of a Theological Institution, it was proposed,—*in the absence of Mr. Bunting,** and *without his knowledge*, and also, *without any previous concert*—that he should be requested to allow himself to be nominated to the Conference, as President of such an Institution, and of this proposal Dr. Warren himself professed his hearty and entire approval. Mr. Bunting, having been informed on his return, of what the rest of the Committee had determined in his absence, objected to their nomination of any officers at all, and especially he objected to the nomination, by which so great an honour was proposed to be conferred upon himself. His objections were, however, overruled by the solicitations of his Brethren—in which solicitations, let it be observed that Dr. Warren himself personally and actively concurred. And it was at this particular juncture that Mr. Entwisle—the “venerable member of the Committee” referred to in p. 22, of the “Remarks”), addressed to Mr. Bunting—not “unwittingly,” but with his characteristic simplicity and openness—words to the following effect: “it is quite useless for you to persist in your objection, for we have settled this business—(not as Dr. Warren reports, “*previous* to the Meeting,” but)—*before you came.*” On this it was proposed—(with the express concurrence of Dr. Warren himself)—that Mr. Bunting should be requested to name such persons as he might judge proper for the Tutorships. To this proposal Mr. Bunting gave a peremptory and decided negative, and forthwith Dr. Warren proposed an individual for the Theological Tutorship. And so the affair of “officers” proceeded, until it terminated in the rejection of an amendment proposed by Dr. Warren in reference to another Tutorship, and the consequent

* His absence was occasioned by the necessity of his attending elsewhere at that time, upon important business connected with a Fund for which he is Trustee.

approval of a nomination which had been previously offered. In the Pamphlet which was subsequently published, the "Proposals concerning the officers of the Institution" were omitted, not "*in order to* represent to the Connexion the *unanimity* of the Committee,"—though it was perfectly true, that the Committee were unanimous, not only in *all* the conclusions which they published, but also in the *first* of the "Proposals about officers," which they did not publish,—but those Proposals were omitted for the reason which is honestly stated in their Pamphlet, and because the question to be laid, in the interval between that time and the Conference, before the Preachers and others, was whether an Institution such as that which they proposed would be expedient—rather than who should be the officers. And the fact is, that subsequently two out of the four nominations were abandoned, and the remaining nominations were reserved to be submitted to the Conference.

Now from this statement it is clear, that as to the principle of "interfering with the proper and exclusive prerogative of the Conference," Dr. Warren must be as deeply implicated as any of his Brethren, and that he cannot, in bar of censure, claim the privilege of being "king's evidence" against the rest; since, supposing them to have offended, they have themselves confessed, before his evidence appeared, the thing of which they have been guilty. It is farther clear that Mr. Bunting, if fairly implicated in the case at all, was *last* and *least* in the transgression, being, so far as hitherto appears, the only individual amongst them, who interposed a protest on behalf of "the prerogative," which Dr. Warren, in conjunction with his Brethren, so "unceremoniously" invaded. And, after all, what is there in those facts which are admitted? The nomination of officers was not a very extravagant assumption—if any assumption at all—on the part of a Committee which had been sanctioned by the Conference, as being competent to such a task as that of "arranging a Plan for the improvement of the Junior Preachers." For the *Plan* to be arranged was certainly the most difficult and weighty part of

the whole business. The selection of the officers was an affair of very subordinate consideration. It was therefore no very great transgression, if, after having finished the *greater* task, with which they were especially entrusted, they proceeded further to exercise a little judgment, *in reserve*, upon the *less*. Nor is it very startling, except to those persons who are professedly on the look-out for things "perilous and detrimental," that they should have selected the officers from amongst themselves. Those members of the Committee by whom the various nominations were proposed or adopted, could not but be sensible, that, whatever might be the "character and qualifications" of others who were not of the Committee, they had, *in* the Committee, men who might, with great advantage to themselves, be compared with "the ablest and most respectable of their Brethren." And if officers were at that time to be named at all, why should a false delicacy forbid their doing that which their deliberate judgment and conscience so entirely approved?—With all submission to the Doctor, "the fairness of their *motives*" is not to be taxed before the public, because they ventured to propose, for certain offices, such men from amongst themselves as, on a general appeal to the great body of the Preachers, an almost universal acclamation would declare to be the men best fitted to sustain them; and the gross charges, on which they have been summoned, must, according to the custom of the country to which the Doctor is indebted for his title, be sent back "not proven."

The most formidable part of the whole business seems to be, the "smothering accumulation of offices" on a single individual. That individual must needs be greatly indebted to the Doctor for his sympathy; but the truth is, that had he been capable of being "smothered," either by *office* or by *insult*, he would have been smothered long ago. As to the Presidency of the Institution, can any one inform us, what are the duties that will make that office so onerous and overwhelming? and, what is the particular power connected with it, that is likely to exert so baneful an effect? As to the

“Theological Tutorship,” Dr. Warren has “feared where no fear was,” since nothing more was at any time contemplated, than that Mr. Bunting should render occasional assistance. He may, now at least, dismiss all fear upon that subject, as he is not appointed to a Theological Tutorship at all, but is simply requested to render “such assistance in that department, as *his other duties may enable him to afford*.”* And what is the power of the Committee generally? And under what circumstances does their power, whatever it may be, threaten to be “detrimental,” so long as there remains a power in the Conference to call them to account, and to censure or dismiss, both them and all the other officers, at pleasure?

To such enquiries the only answer furnished by the Doctor's Pamphlet is, that “we have only to suppose the President of the Institution to be possessed of *Episcopal* propensities, and it follows of course, that the Institution will soon become, neither more nor less, neither better nor worse—if indeed worse can come of it—than a *Dominant Episcopal Faction*!—from which the Connexion must prepare itself to receive a Liturgical Service, a splendid Ritual, an illegitimate Episcopal Ordination, a cassocked race of Ecclesiastics, and whatever else may render this new, this improved edition of Methodism imposing and magnificent in the eyes of the world.”† It would be easy to retort upon the Doctor, by taking the licence which his example gives us, of “*only supposing*” any thing we please; but we forbear.—We have already intimated that one great fault of his Pamphlet is, that it makes no distinction between *men* and *things*; and this fault, it will be seen, is perpetually vitiating his arguments; or, where there is no argument to vitiate, still it vitiates his phraseology. In the present instance, if, instead of looking at certain *men* whom he appears to have in view, he had looked at the *thing* itself, whereof he was affirming, he never could have asserted that, on the supposition of the President's “desiring the office of a Bishop,” the things just now enumerated would “follow of course;” much less could he have been guilty of the absurdity

* Minutes of Conference, 1834, p. 97. † Remarks, p. 23.

of saying that an *Institution* may become a *Faction* ! The passage in question, however, and the general tenor of the paragraph of which it is a part, are still more deeply reprehensible. In a preceding page, the Doctor stigmatizes the establishment of a Theological Institution, as an "endeavour to pander to the taste of fastidious hearers."* Admitting this to be its fault, whether is the greater fault, to pander to the *taste* of those who are "fastidious," or to pander to their *prejudices* and their *passions* ? The Doctor has chosen the latter course ; and hence the string of consequences which dangles, *ad captandum*, from his gratuitous hypothesis of "Episcopal propensities." It is quite useless to attempt the redemption of that paragraph from the condemnation which belongs to it, by a profession of zeal on behalf "of our original—characteristic simplicity and piety." If that simplicity and piety were fairly represented in the *spirit* of the paragraph in question, it would be no great loss, were we to "supply their place with showy Chapels and pealing Organs." Even showy Chapels and pealing Organs may not entirely exclude the presence and blessing of Him, who so often shone forth from "between the Cherubim" amidst the splendours of the Jewish temple, and the music of those who "played skilfully with a loud noise." They may, in some degree at least, be found compatible with that grace of charity, without which "all *faith*" avails as little as "all *knowledge* ;" and in the absence of which, not even "the gift of prophecy" itself, with or without "the tongues of men and angels," can redeem its possessor from the character of "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

In connexion with this subject, we cannot omit to notice the unworthy slur which Dr. Warren has, with so little provocation, cast upon the liberality of certain "rich men," by whom, in part, the project of an Institution is supported. In adopting against them the severe remark which was applied by the ill-fated Laocoon to the Greeks, he would appear to suspect that the Institution, which they patronize, is the

* Remarks, p. 18.

wooden horse, by means of which the "heaven-built towers" of Methodism are to be taken and destroyed. In conformity with this idea, which is implied in his quotation, he might very properly have quoted several of the lines, immediately preceding that of which he has given us a part, as a summary of all his fears upon the subject of the Institution,—

" Aut hoc inclusi ligno occultantur Achivi,
Aut hæc in nostros fabricata est machina muros,
Inspectura domos, venturaque desuper urbi ;
Aut aliquis latet error ; equo ne credite, Teucri.
Quicquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."*

But, unfortunately, the Doctor himself, as having been one of those by whom the scheme was first "concocted," must, notwithstanding his recent desertion to another "cause," be still regarded as being scarcely less guilty than others his accomplices,—

" ————— ipse doli fabricator Epeus."

And further, the comparison of these "rich men" to the Greeks is as inappropriate as it is ungenerous. They are not the *natural* and *avowed* enemies of Methodism, as the Greeks were the enemies of Troy. Whether worthy or unworthy of such fellowship, they are *acknowledged* at least as being "fellow-citizens with" ourselves of the same Zion, and members of the same "family and household." And, though their wealth may be connected with deceitful and powerful temptations both to themselves and others, yet these are not the only temptations, nor, under present circumstances, are they the principal temptations, by which our safety as a Body is endangered. In addition to "the deceitfulness of riches," there are "the lusts of other things" besides. Dr. Warren has, by his example, put us into the humour of quoting out of Virgil ; we

* "This hollow fabric either must enclose,
Within its blind recess, our secret foes ;
Or, 'tis an engine raised above the town,
T' o'erlook the walls, and then to batter down,
Somewhat is sure design'd by fraud or force—
Trust not their presents, nor admit the horse."

DRYDEN.

would therefore proceed to say that, should the Providence of God permit the day to come when "the city of our solemnities" must be destroyed and forsaken, there have been, and there are still, some of these "rich men," whose Wesleyan *patriotism* and prowess have been such, as that, amidst its desolation, they might justly say—in the affecting words which that Poet has attributed to the most illustrious of the Trojan princes,—

" si Pergama dextra
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent."

If the Doctor is inclined to speculate upon the dangers which at this moment threaten us, there is another point to which his attention may be much more properly and advantageously directed,—

" That quarter most the skilful Greeks annoy,
Where yon *wild fig-trees* join the walls of Troy."

But we must quit this topic—adding only that, so far from plotting any mischief against our "holy city," in that project, for their support of which they are now pointed at as objects of suspicion, the leading patrons of the Wesleyan Theological Institution, are seeking to construct an additional Palladium, which, as they earnestly pray and hope, may, by the blessing of Almighty God, be for the ornament and the protection of the city.

It is proper to notice, further, the attempt which Dr. Warren has made to stigmatize the Meeting held in London, on Saturday, July 26th, as a "Meeting *got up* for the purpose of eliciting an opinion favourable to the projected Institution." The truth is, that this Meeting was agreed on at the Meeting of the Committee in October, as is evident from the *ninth* of the Resolutions which they then adopted, and to which, be it always remembered, we have the sanction of Dr. Warren's *personal vote*, as well as of his name. Among other things that Resolution directs—

" That the President and Secretary of the Conference be respectfully requested to invite such Preachers, and other influential friends, from various parts of the kingdom, as they may think proper, to meet this

Committee for the purpose of a friendly conversation, with a view to explain the nature and advantages of the proposed Plan, to receive their opinion and counsel respecting it, and to ascertain, before the meeting of the Conference, in what degree it is likely to obtain the pecuniary support of our Societies and Congregations ; and that this Meeting shall take place on Saturday, the 26th of next July.”*

And it was simply in conformity with that Resolution, and consequently in conformity with the expressed opinion of Dr. Warren, that the Meeting was convened. The President, on his own behalf and that of the Secretary, (who was then absent from the country), did “invite such Preachers and other influential friends as he thought proper,” and the avowed objects of the Meeting were faithfully adhered to. Moreover, Dr. Warren, though not one of the “*Friends of the Institution*,” was present at that Meeting, as was also another Preacher whom he reports as having subsequently voted in favour of his “Amendment ;” and there were also lay-men present, who were neither committed to the *principle* of a Theological Institution, nor to the *Plan* which the Committee had prepared.

Let the reader now carefully review the charges directly or indirectly brought against the Institution Committee, and say whether the “Remarks” of Dr. Warren present “a faithful and candid statement” of their motives and their conduct. If they do not, his *Fourth* Reason falls with the charges which are intended to support it. Or, if they do, still they are charges against *the character of individuals*, and not against the *principle* of a Theological Institution. And thus, in either case, that *Fourth* Reason, with all its importance, as being *the* Reason in which all “the other Reasons are contained,” and “from which they flow,”—leaves the *thing* untouched, against which the Doctor has professed to argue, and so allows us the liberty of saying that, for any thing his Pamphlet demonstrates to the contrary, the establishment of the Wesleyan Theological Institution is a most useful and praise-worthy undertaking.

* “Proposals, &c.” of the October Committee, p. 34.

In addition to the reflections on the Institution Committee, the "Remarks" of Dr. Warren contain certain other reflections on those who ultimately concurred with that Committee, that is, on the Conference in general.* These reflections may now be briefly noticed.

One of these reflections is, that "the measure" has been "indecently hurried into accomplishment,"† and that its adoption is the result of "hasty proceedings."‡ And such statements would induce the reader to suppose, that it is a measure which, in *principle* as well as in *plan*, has been but "lately concocted." It has already appeared, however,§ that the adoption of the *principle*, by Mr. Wesley and the Conference, may be traced as far back as the year 1744, and we have Dr. Warren's own authority for saying that, "in pleading for such a system of tuition as that which they have sketched, the Committee have not acted at variance with Mr. Wesley's original purposes, but have only attempted to revive and perfect one of his early and favourite plans," which, although "not able to accomplish, he endeavoured to approach as nearly as possible."|| Considering therefore the length of time which has elapsed since Mr. Wesley's death, if there be any "indecenty" connected with the case, it is not the indecency of an impetuous *hurry*, but that of a long and—one might almost say—criminal *delay*. The Conference has not, however, been altogether inattentive to the subject. The

* An attempt is made to shew that a considerable proportion of the Preachers present at the Conference, were *neutral* in the business, and that "the number of Preachers who did not vote on either side of the question, must have been between 150 and 200 !" So it was reported ; but *in the hearing of Dr. Warren*, that report was declared by the Conference in general to be an incorrect one, and was admitted so to be, by one who voted in support of the Amendment, and whose situation on the platform gave him the fairest opportunity of judging. The writer of this Defence was also in "an advantageous situation for viewing the state of the vote," and he is bound to say that the number of those who did not vote on either side, must have been very small indeed.

† Remarks, p. 34. ‡ Remarks, p. 32. § Vide *supra*, p. 20.

|| "Proposals, &c." of the October Committee, p. 11—12.

Pamphlet printed by order of the Conference, in 1807*—the Proceedings of the Conferences of 1815, 1823, and 1824,† and of all the Conferences from 1829 to 1834 inclusive—go to prove that “the more effectual improvement of the Junior Preachers” has been a subject of frequent and most anxious deliberation. And during the last mentioned period, in particular, the same subject has, annually, through the medium of the Conference “Minutes,” been suggested to the consideration of the whole Methodist Connexion. In the course of these years, various plans have been *proposed*, and some have been *tried*, but little has hitherto been *done*, to meet that “want of an efficient method of training, which has been always felt, and always acknowledged.” Under these circumstances, the Committee, appointed at the Conference of 1833, after spending *several days* together in deliberation on the subject, and having subsequently, during an interval of several months, examined the whole business in their own minds and with their friends in private, agreed at last, with the additional sanction of many others, both Preachers and laymen, to recommend the “Plan” which the Conference has adopted. The Doctor appeals to “any candid and impartial person” to “say, whether, in the history of Methodism, any measure was ever more indecently hurried into accomplishment.” We may now, with much stronger assurance of an answer in our favour, appeal to all candid and impartial persons to say, what measure in the history of Methodism has ever been longer and more deliberately canvassed.

Another charge against the Conference is, that their “method of proceeding,” on the subject of the Institution, is “utterly at variance with *the spirit* of a pledge given to the People in 1797, which assures the connexion that in order to prevent any degree of precipitation in making new Rules, and to obtain information of the sentiments of our people, no Regulations will be finally confirmed, till after a year’s con-

* Entitled, “Observations on the importance of adopting a plan of Instruction for those Preachers who are admitted upon Trial in the Methodist Connexion.”

† See “Proposals, &c.” of the October Committee, p. 13.

sideration, and the knowledge of the sentiments of the Connexion at large, through the medium of their public officers." And we presume it is by their (imagined) violation of this "pledge," that Dr. Warren supposes the measure in question to have been "carried with so high a hand over the People."*

In reply to this charge, let it be observed that Dr. Warren has omitted certain words, which are material to the right understanding of the sentence he has quoted. The Conference does not say that, "in order to prevent precipitation in making new Rules, no Regulations will be finally confirmed,"—but, "*we have agreed to the 7th Head,†* by which no Regulations, &c." The sentence is thus, in itself, not a distinct Rule, or pledge, but only a *comment* on the Rule or "pledge" contained in the 7th Head or Regulation; and, in all reason, the application of the *comment* should only be co-extensive with the obvious meaning of the *text*. In order that the reader may see the meaning of that Regulation, it is here inserted, together with the Regulation immediately preceding :

VI. We have determined, that all the Rules which relate to the Societies, Leaders, Stewards, Local Preachers, Trustees, and Quarterly Meetings, shall be published with the Rules of the Society, for the benefit and convenience of all the members.

VII. In respect to all new rules, which shall be made by the Conference,

It is determined, that if at any time the Conference see it necessary to make any new rule for the Societies at large, and such rule should be objected to, at the first Quarterly Meeting in any given circuit; and if the major part of that meeting, in conjunction with the Preachers, be of opinion, that the enforcing of such rule in that Circuit will be injurious to the prosperity of that Circuit; it shall not be enforced in opposition to the judgment of such Quarterly Meeting, before the second Conference. But, if the rule be confirmed by the second Conference, it shall be binding to the whole connexion. Nevertheless, the Quarterly Meetings, rejecting a new rule, shall not, by publications, public meetings, or otherwise, make that rule a cause of contention; but shall strive, by every means, to preserve the peace of the connexion.

It is thus manifest that the "new Rules," referred to in Dr. Warren's quotation, are "Rules for the Societies at large,"

* Remarks, p. 34. † Of the "Regulations made at Leeds in 1797."

and such Rules as, after a year's deliberation, may be "*enforced*" in any Circuit, and "be *binding* on the whole Connexion." Now, does this character belong to the "Plan" of the Wesleyan Institution? Is it a system of "Rules for the Societies at large," or for any one of those Societies? If so, we may expect to have it inserted in the next edition of the "Rules relating to the Society," appended to our Class-Books. Is it not rather, if a system of Rules at all, a system of Rules relating entirely to the *Junior Preachers* and their *Tutors*? And are these Rules to be "*enforced*" in any Circuit? Or are they to be regarded as *binding* on the whole Connexion? The very contrary: the Institution is to be supported by voluntary contributions; and, if not *so* supported, it must of necessity be discontinued. It is most certain, therefore, that the "pledge" in question cannot fairly be interpreted as having any reference whatever to the point to which the Doctor has applied it; and to describe the recent "proceeding" of the Conference as being "at variance with that pledge," either in "the *spirit*" or the *letter*, is a perfect absurdity. Besides, the establishment of the Institution is not "finally confirmed," and never can be, until its practical utility shall have been so far demonstrated by the results of actual experience, as to secure for it the countenance and support of the Connexion generally. And hence it is expressly provided,*

"That suitable premises for the Tutors and Resident Students of the Institution shall, in the first instance, be *rented*, rather than *bought* or *erected*, in order that *due time* may be afforded *for the trial of the proposed plans*."

And in conformity with this,

"That part of the Plan presented by the Committee, which *limits* the provision *at present* to the number of *Thirty* Resident Students is *especially* approved by the Conference."

Under any circumstances therefore, and even admitting the Plan of the Institution to be a system of "new Rules for the Societies at large," still, as the establishment is neither

* Minutes of Conference, 1834, p. 97.

"*finally* decided," nor designed to be "*enforced*," the charge against the Conference, of having acted at variance with its own pledge, falls to the ground. If Dr. Warren really thinks that it is otherwise, how did it happen that he failed to warn the Committee and the Conference of the fault which they were about to commit, at the time when "this momentous affair" was under their consideration? It was not that he *forgot* "how far the *People* are concerned in it;" for to that topic no inconsiderable prominence is given in "The Speech" which he delivered. This violation of the "pledge" of 1797, like his first Three Reasons against the Institution, is plainly an *after-thought*; and it has as little application, as those Reasons have been shown to have, to the point for which it is intended. That the *People* are deeply interested in the Plan which, after much deliberation and enquiry, the Conference has resolved to *try*, is very certain. And it is equally certain that great respect is due to the scruples and objections of those persons who, after calm and careful attention to the subject, and without being swayed by personal or party feeling, are disposed to view it with suspicion, or even with disapprobation. The holy jealousy with which *they* watch against whatever might endanger our "original—characteristic simplicity and piety," throws a *halo* around all their thinkings, and even around what may ultimately prove to be their very *prejudices* and *errors*, on that subject, which admonishes us to touch them with a gentle hand. And such is really the temper with which their objections are regarded, in the quarter against which so much clamour is directed. Much as the Conference has been slandered on that point, it still remains a truth that there is no Assembly, where the judgment of such persons, when *properly* communicated, is received with a more candid and respectful attention, whether such communications come in the form of Speeches delivered by those that are "*within*," or in the form of Memorials from those that are "*without*."

The "Brethren who seconded and supported the Amendment," and whose addresses are characterized as having been, so "dignified, eloquent and argumentative," were listened to

without being interrupted by "rudeness" or "clamour." And especially the Brother "who seconded the Amendment,"* though somewhat eccentric and irregular in his remarks, was nevertheless allowed a hearing so silent and respectful, that at the close of his Address he found it his duty to *express* to the Conference his "grateful acknowledgment of the attention with which he had been favoured." As to memorials from *without*, Dr. Warren has been pleased to assert that "not a few Remonstrances" against the intended Institution "were sent to the Conference from highly respectable quarters," and that these Remonstrances "were not even *read*."—What was the fact? *Six*, or, at the utmost, *seven* communications, on that subject, (including that "from Trustees of Chapels in or near London"),† were sent to the late Conference. Of these, *two* were *in favour* of the Institution, so that the number of Remonstrances, so gravely represented to have been "not a few," dwindles down to *three* or *four*, leaving a *majority* of *one*, or *two*, Memorials *against* the Institution. And, though these communications were not read *at length*, yet the names of the *individuals*, or *parties*, from whom they came, and the *general purport* of each communication, were distinctly and respectfully presented to the attention of the Conference. The *colouring*, which Dr. Warren's statements give to these affairs, and many others, is but in sorry "*keeping*"—as the artists say—with the *candour* and *impartiality*, which he lays down as the "*ground*" of his strange picture. Were we disposed to borrow his *palette*, with the *leavings* of his colours still fresh upon it, it would be no difficult affair to draw another picture, as a match to that which he has recently exhibited. The "Remarks," themselves contain sufficient specimens of *hyperbole* and *contradiction*, to furnish such a picture. But the subject is too grave and important to be treated in so light and indecorous a manner; and it is high

* The Rev. James Bromley.

† Both "time" and pains were taken to induce other Trustees to sign the Memorial, but without success.

time for the attention of the Methodist Body to be transferred from all *mere pictures*—be the artist who he may—to “the things, which make for their *peace*.”

Nearly twenty years have now elapsed, since the “Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society” was first established. The Plan of that Society, and all the apparatus by means of which its *domestic* operations are conducted, originated chiefly in the zeal and prudence of the very parties who are now most prominent in forwarding the project of a Theological Institution. And very grave and formidable were the objections which, from various quarters, were raised up against the scheme, as being not only something *new* in Methodism, but as savouring of a “carnal and worldly policy,” and as tending, moreover, to drain off those pecuniary supplies, which were necessary to the maintenance and prosperity of other matters in which our people were more nearly interested. The writer has now before him a letter on that subject, written in the year 1814, by one of the most grave and venerable of all the worthies our Connexion has produced, and whose objections to this “Yorkshire system”—as he calls it—were not less honourable to his Wesleyan and Christian feeling, than the recantation which he has subsequently published. Among other things he says—

“I very much feared our stone-wall would be broken down, and our vine-yard be all overrun with briars and thorns. We are not what we ought to be : but, if we do not watch and pray, we shall go the way of all flesh. I most cordially disapprove of the efforts lately made in our Connexion, in imitation of the ————. It may be congenial to that people ; but our people we have thought to be the people of God, and therefore ought not to be treated like the world with shows and exhibitions. I very much love several of the Preachers who have been engaged in this business ; and I doubt not their intention is pure. But I think they are mistaken ; and their mistake is a dangerous one, and the experiment will have consequences which they do not foresee.”

Such were the honest and godly fears which the estimable writer of these words *then* entertained, along with many others. But he has lived to see and to acknowledge that his fears were groundless ; and he has been for many years one of

the most zealous and effective supporters of the system which, on its first appearance, himself and others regarded with so much suspicion.

The Wesleyan Theological Institution has also the appearance of being something *new* in our Connexion, although in *principle* it is almost coeval with Methodism itself. And many are the fears which *some* of the best friends of Methodism entertain as to its tendency, not only in regard to the Students, on whom it will directly operate, but also in regard to the Connexion generally. It is a disadvantage much to be lamented, but not to be avoided, that this projected Institution cannot, *all at once*, present that evidence in its own favour which properly belongs to it. In other words, it cannot, like our *domestic* Missionary system, “commend itself,” by any *immediate and palpable effects*, to those persons whose “conscience” no other kind of evidence will satisfy. The stoutest objectors to our new Missionary apparatus—and stout objectors there have been—have only had to give themselves the trouble of attending a few Missionary Meetings, and their objections have vanished into air; or, rather, they have been converted into devout admiration and praise. But the Theological Institution has no such blazon connected with its operation. Its *name* is sufficiently public, but its working and effect will for some time be in the *closet* and the *study*; and its advocates must be content that it shall work its way, in comparative retirement, and against many prejudices, perhaps for several years to come, before its true and proper influence can be extensively perceived. And when that influence begins to show itself, it will not be—and in the nature of the thing it cannot be—by a sudden and irresistible burst of evidence, like that by which, in our Missionary Meetings, all hearts at once are overpowered. But like the “doctrine” which it is intended to inculcate and diffuse, it will “distil as the dew,” and “as the showers that water the earth.”

In conclusion, the writer of these pages, though he is far from being so sanguine as to hope that all his readers will, at once, be brought to one opinion on the subject of the Institu-

tion, yet earnestly hopes that to many of his readers it will have been made evident that the Plan which, "after much and careful deliberation," the Conference has adopted, is at least worthy of the *trial* intended to be made, and that some better reasons than have hitherto appeared, ought to be brought forwards, before the Conference can be justified, either to itself, or to the "Methodist Body," in suffering that Plan to be abandoned. In this matter, whatever some persons may imagine to the contrary, the Preachers can have no interest apart from that of the Societies, whose "servants" they are "for Jesus' sake," and for whose benefit it is their duty—whether "through *evil*," or "through *good* report"—still to pursue those means, by which they have reason to believe the welfare of those Societies, and the general interests of pure and vital godliness, will be most effectually and extensively promoted.